

Stress and Coping: A Historical Perspective

Rekha Mahajan¹

¹Assistant professor, Department of commerce and management, DAV College, Amritsar

Cite this paper as: Rekha Mahajan, (2025) Stress and Coping: A Historical Perspective. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 2 (4), 2298-2306

KEYWORDS <i>Stress Management; Stress and Coping Mechanisms; History of Stress & Coping.</i>	ABSTRACT We are all familiar with the word “Stress”. This is the bane of this modern day society. While dealing with the rigors of modern day life, most people in today’s society end up in distress due to ever increasing demands, transitions and challenges. This has definite impact on an individual’s productivity and output, but the response mechanism varies from person to person depending on his / her coping methodology to deal with Stress. The purpose of this study is two- fold: to understand the history of stress, typology of stress, theories of stress and to provide suitable understanding in coping mechanism. Eventually, this paper aims in providing an insightful study on different variables associated with stress, and their direct or indirect effects on mental & physical health and impact on relationships will be taken into account. The result and the explanations of this literature might help to find out the main reason for their stressors, best way to cope and greatest technique to use in managing stress.
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

1. INTRODUCTION

First of all, this article discusses theories that reflect various approaches to stress research: Selye's theory of 'systemic stress' based on physiology and psychobiology, and Lazarus's 'psychological stress' model. The definition of coping is defined in the second section. Two independent parameters can distinguish coping theories: trait-oriented versus state-oriented, and micro-analytic versus macro-analytic approaches. The word stress has been gaining prominence in the behavioral and health sciences for the last five decades. It was first used in physics to explore the problem of how to design manmade structures to bear heavy loads and to avoid deformation by external emphasis. Stress referred to external pressure or force applied to a structure in this study, while strain denoted the resulting object's internal distortion (for the background of the term, cf. Hinkle 1974, Mason 1975a, 1975c). The use of the word stress shifted in the transition from physics to the behavioral sciences. It now recognizes body processes generated by conditions that place physical or psychological demands on a person in most approaches (Selye 1976). The internal forces that affect the body are known as stressors (McGrath 1982).

1. Stress

Stress is something that gets in the way of people's daily lives and their physical and mental health. This happens when the body goes beyond what it can do or when someone asks for something strange. Stress is the mental and physical strain that comes from how we deal with stress from the outside environment. When under pressure, people often feel stressed, unable to focus, and have a number of bodily symptoms, such as headaches and a fast heartbeat.

"Stress arises when people perceive that they cannot meet the demands made on them adequately or with demands made on them or threats to their well-being." Lazarus, R.S. (in 1966). A stressor is a stress producing source. On the basis of how the individual responds, a stressor may be either positive or negative. For instance, one person may see stress as a motivator, while another individual may recognize it as a restriction. Stress may be either negative or positive. Positive stress is referred to as eustress, and depression as negative stress. Distress affects a person's physical and emotional well being. Eustress trigger imaginative output of the body and mind. Distress has a negative pressure that affects a person's mental composure. Insomnia, eating disorders, heart attacks and suicidal thoughts are some of these problems.

1.1. History of Stress

The definition of Stress has recently acquired ample significance; however, it is possible to trace the emergence of the word back to the seventeenth century. Stress is a broad term that touches many disciplines; thus, stress needs to be studied using the systematic approach. Therefore, it is important to research the history of stress in order to reach various disciplines at



different points in time. The past of stress can be divided into the following time frames: the early years, the twentieth century from the beginning of the twentieth century: the early years, the twentieth century: Richard Lazarus from the 1950s

1.1.1. From the Early Beginnings of the 20th Century

Hans Selye (1975) considered that the word 'stress' was regarded as the definition of hardship in the seventeenth century, later, in the eighteen and nineteen centuries, stress was interpreted as force, pressure or strain and the idea was very well taken over in the field of science and engineering. As the idea began to develop, a reasonable degree of consistency was evident that drew the attention of the researcher to the field. Some of the researchers created an engineering analogy of stress with the human body that, like machines, caused the concept of 'wear and tear' of the human body. Furthermore, they claimed that the human body needs certain energy, like computers, to make it work properly and energy may tend to deviate their output or cause discontinuation. The nervous system, which is necessary for the body to function, can produce the required energy. Nervous disorders caused considerable concern at the beginning of the nineteenth century. The human nervous system has been ill-equipped to cope with modern life's complexities. Researchers were inspired to research the phenomenon and to recognize causes that cause mental disorders because of the broad prevalence of such illnesses. By reducing 'social disapproval' for such a mental disorder, which led to further medical and scientific evaluation of stress, these kinds of studies played a key role in understanding the issue of mental illness in society. Many forms of study adapted to the reductionist viewpoint in the twentieth century, where human behavior was analyzed using biological and physiological concepts. Mechanistic theories of biology arose from the same line, suggesting that there was nothing strange about life since it is possible to describe the behavior of all species in a similar way. Therefore, the three founding forms of psychology arose at the end of the nineteenth century: consciousness, unconsciousness and adaptation. Hence, the idea developed in the field of engineering, with the aid of mechanistic view, transferred to biology and physiology.

1.1.2. The Early Years: The 20th Century

The 20th century was a century of science and technology. Many significant developments have been identified in this century, such as increasing the use of the word 'stress', widening the field of psychology due to the establishment of a school of functionalism, increased concern for job performance and exhaustion and mental hygiene issues, and more significantly, understanding the importance of psychosocial factors in disease. These advances gave fresh direction to the stress sector and in the future provided fertile ground for research. Therefore, several researchers have sought to explore the field by considering new developments. Nevertheless, three major contributors made a remarkable contribution: Walter Cannon, Hans Selye and Harold Wolff. First, the psychosomatic method was initiated by Walter Cannon, who reintroduced the human aspect to the field of medicine. The idea of homeostasis, which is known as 'staying power' or the capacity of the body to preserve its own consistency and 'battle' and 'flight' reactions to stress, was also introduced by Walter. Walter is one of the major contributors to the stress invasion experience of biology and medicine. Of course, his work is not without criticisms, major criticisms, rather points of clarification, concern the essence of the homeostasis principle and homeostasis images. Hans Selye, second, tried to expose the past of tension, but it was very controversial. Selye's important contribution can be split into two periods of time: before and after the Second World War. He clearly described stress syndrome in the post-world war period and also introduced the General Adaptation Syndrome concept that explains how organisms react to stress. Selye also suggested that there were four variations of stress: good stress (eustress), poor stress (distress), over-stress (hyper-stress) and stress (hypo stress). Selye had to face obstacles from psychological scientists working in the field. Third, Harold Wolff explained how stress in life played an important role in causing diseases. In addition, he added that in adverse periods of their lives, people are more susceptible to illness. Throughout the decades, the physiological approach to stress has had a massive effect on stress studies. In order to understand stress, however, the psychological perspective on stress needs to be addressed as the critical element of stress research is a psychological perspective.

1.1.3. The Twentieth Century: from the 1950s to Richard Lazarus

Stress had become an established term in the discipline of psychology by this period. Psychological variables, nevertheless, were historically considered by physiologists to be negligible experimental influences. In the field of psychology, the development of stress as a term can be traced to psychosomatic theories, where the functions of psychosocial factors have been recognized to describe the disorder. However, in establishing causal links between life events & illness and the role of personality variables in illness, it had to face difficulties. As it contributed to the opening of a fresh process of stress research, these problems became a vital part of the history of stress research. In order to address the issue, the first problem was to create a causal relation between life events and illness; sufficient, accurate and reliable measures of both concepts were required. Therefore, mostly, significant traumatic life events were used to classify stressful incidences that were of utmost significance to individuals (subjects) and more; these life events were highly researchable. The Social Readjustment Rating Scale (SRRS), created in 1967 by Holmes and Rahe, was one of the pioneers of scale-building in a stressful life case. Nevertheless, researchers had to face difficulties and challenges using it. They were, thus, pushed to build better constructs. Therefore, attempts were made to establish everyday stress and uplift scales.

The basic aim was to create a scale that included comprehensive life challenges perceived by people who might not be fully impartial (R.S. Lazarus, 1984). The debate, however, was initiated by researchers preferring objective event orientation, vital life event approach, and personal assessment of an event, everyday challenges, and scales of uplifts. The key thing was



confounding. Confounding can be described as an overlap of steps, life events, and disease symptoms; it is the occurrence of life that appears to be part of disease symptoms. Lazarus argued that if it is accepted that stress is always a consequence of the assessment process, there would necessarily be a certain degree of misunderstanding between stress indicators and disease. In addition, he pointed out that the assessment process is the relationship between the person and the environment; hence, absolute objectivity is unrealistic in the stress process. He later concluded that there were no real problems with both of the measures. Similarly, the relationship between coronary heart disorders and Type A personality was investigated by researchers. As several of the researchers could not re-establish the relationship, it had to face several challenges; thus, the validity was challenged. As a result, several researchers assumed that it was important to meticulously check the relation between personality and diseases. This conviction led them to explore individual variations in the analysis of stress. In addition, as research conventionally focuses on understanding differences between people in their thinking about stressor and reactions to stress, there is no surprise. Researchers developed three types of individual differences to explain and identify individual differences: hereditary, acquired and dispositional. Genetic individual differences are based on gender, constitution, intelligence, and reactivity; acquired differences are due to neuroticism, Type A, the locus of influence, self-esteem, and extroversion-introversion due to social status, education and age and dispositional attributes. Many other researchers have also focused on variables such as negative affectivity, hardness and control locus. Most of them claimed, however, that more work needs to be done in assessing, defining the correct methodological perspective, and also developing an integrated system that incorporates individual differences into the stress process. Therefore, as it advanced rapidly in the discipline of Psychology, the 1950s and 1960s proved to be a crucial phase in stress research, but researchers claimed that stress research faces a challenge that researchers will not embrace new opportunities and will proceed with their work.

1.2. Theories of stress

1.2.1. The Systemic Stress: The Theory of Selye

In science and mass media, the prominence of the stress definition derives primarily from the work of the endocrinologist Hans Selye. He found in a series of animal experiments that a variety of stimulus events (e.g., heat, cold, toxic agents) applied intensively and for a reasonable length of time are capable of producing similar effects, indicating that they are not unique to either stimulus event. (In addition to these non-specific changes in the body, each stimulus, of course, causes its specific effect, heat, for example, produces vasodilatation and cold vasoconstriction.) According to Selye, the stereotypical, i.e. specific, response pattern of systemic stress constitutes these non-specifically induced changes. Selye (1976, p. 64) describes this stress as 'a condition manifested by a syndrome consisting of all the modifications in a biological system that are not directly caused.' This stereotypical pattern of reaction, called the 'General Adaptation Syndrome' (GAS), continues in three stages.

Alarm reaction stage: When under stress, the alarm reaction stage refers to the initial symptoms that the body encounters. The "fight-or-flight" response, which is a physiological response to stress, might be familiar to you. In risky circumstances, this natural reflex prepares you to either escape or defend yourself. Your heart rate rises, cortisol (a stress hormone) is released by your adrenal gland and you get an adrenaline boost, which increases energy. In the warning reaction point, this fight-or-flight response occurs.

Resistance stage: The body starts to heal itself after the initial shock of a traumatic event and after getting a fight-or-flight reaction. A lower cortisol volume is released, and your heart rate and blood pressure are starting to normalize. Although your body begins this process of healing, it remains for a while on high alert. Your body continues to fix itself until your hormone levels, heart rate, and blood pressure hit a pre-stress condition if you resolve stress and the problem is no longer an issue. For long periods of time, certain stressful circumstances continue. It gradually adapts and learns how to cope with a higher degree of stress if you don't overcome the stress and your body stays on high alert. At this point, in an effort to cope with stress, the body goes through changes that you are unaware of. The stress hormone continues to be secreted by your body and blood pressure remains elevated. You may assume that you handle stress well, but the physical reaction of your body tells a different story. If the stage of resistance lasts for too long a time without pauses to offset the stress effects, this may lead to the stage of exhaustion. Signs of the stage of resistance include: irritability, annoyance, weak concentration.

Exhaustion phase: The product of excessive or chronic stress is this phase. Fighting long periods of stress will exhaust your physical, emotional, and mental energy to the point that your body no longer has the power to battle stress. You can give up or feel that you are helpless in your situation. Fatigue, burnout, depression, anxiety, reduced stress tolerance are symptoms of fatigue.

While a whole generation of stress researchers was inspired by Selye's work, marked flaws in his theory soon became apparent. First of all, the concept of stress as an answer to a multitude of different events by Selye had the fatal implication that the concept of stress became the melting pot for all sorts of methods. Thus, by being a synonym for various words, such as fear, risk, conflict, or emotional arousal, the notion of stress may lose its scientific validity (cf. Engel 1985). Unique critical problems have been posed, apart from this general reservation. One critique was aimed at the central premise of the theory of a non-specific GAS causation. Mason (1971, 1975b) pointed out that there was a common emotional sense of the stressors seen as successful by Selye: they were new, strange, and foreign to the animal. In terms of helplessness, confusion, and lack of control, the animal's condition could therefore be defined. Consequently, rather than the effects as such, the hormonal



GAS responses followed the (specific) emotional impact of such factors. In line with this assumption, Mason (1975b) showed that no GAS was detected in experiments where uncertainty had been removed. This critique leads to a second, broader argument: the stress encountered by humans is almost always the product of cognitive mediation, unlike the physiological stress investigated by Selye (cf. Arnold 1960, Janis 1958, Lazarus 1966, 1974). However, Selye does not identify certain mechanisms that could clarify the cognitive transformation of 'objective' adverse experiences into the subjective experience of distress. Furthermore, Selye does not take coping mechanisms into account as major mediators of the relationship between stress and outcome. Both subjects are central to theories of psychological stress, as developed by the Lazarus group, for instance.

The study on critical life events is a derivative of the systematic approach. An example is the influential theory of Holmes and Rahe (1967), based on the work of Selye, that the origin of disease includes changes in habits, rather than the danger or sense of crucial events. The authors believed that, regardless of their particular (e.g., positive or negative) quality, essential life experiences stimulate change that poses challenges for the organism. However, much of this study was not scientifically inspired and showed no empirical support for this hypothesis (for a critical evaluation, see Thoits 1983).

1.2.2. Psychological Stress: The Lazarus Theory

Two principles are fundamental to every theory of psychological stress: assessment, i.e., assessment by individuals of the importance of what is going on for their well-being, and coping, i.e., attempts by individuals in thinking and action to manage particular demands (cf. Lazarus 1993). The Lazarus stress theory has undergone many critical revisions since its first introduction as a systematic theory (Lazarus 1966). Stress is considered a relational term in the latest version (see Lazarus 1991), i.e., stress is not defined as a particular form of external stimuli or a specific pattern of physiological, behavioral, or subjective reactions. Stress is instead interpreted as a relationship ('transaction') between people and their environment. Psychological stress refers to a relationship with the world that the person considers to be important for his or her well-being and in which the requirements tax or exceed the coping tools available (Lazarus and Folkman 1986, p. 63). Within the person-environment transaction, this concept refers to two mechanisms as key mediators: cognitive evaluation and coping. A central element in understanding stress-relevant transactions is the idea of evaluation, introduced into emotion research by Arnold (1960) and expanded by Lazarus (1966, Lazarus and Launier 1978) with respect to stress processes. This idea is based on the premise that emotional processes (including stress) rely on real perceptions that are manifested by individuals with regard to the importance and outcome of a particular experience. In conditions that are objectively comparable to different individuals, this definition is important to clarify individual variations in the consistency, strength, and length of an elicited emotion. It is commonly believed that a particular pattern of evaluations produces, preserves and ultimately changes the resulting condition. In essence, these judgments are determined by a variety of variables that are personal and situational. Motivational dispositions, priorities, beliefs, and generalized expectations are the most critical variables on the personal side. Predictability, manageability, and imminence of a potentially traumatic occurrence are important situational parameters. Lazarus (1991) established a complete theory of emotion in his monograph on emotion and adaptation, which also contains a stress theory (cf. Lazarus 1993). This principle distinguishes between two basic types of assessment, primary and secondary assessment (see also Lazarus 1966). These types depend on various knowledge sources. Primary assessment concerns if anything of significance to the individual's well being occurs, whereas secondary appraisal concerns coping options.

Three components are differentiated within the primary assessment: target significance defines the degree to which an experience applies to problems that the participant cares about. Goal congruence describes the degree to which, in accordance with personal expectations, an episode continues. The type of ego-involvement refers to elements of personal commitment such as self-esteem, moral principles, ego-ideal, or ego-identity.

Similarly, three secondary evaluation components are distinguished: blame or credit results from the assessment of who is responsible for a certain occurrence by a person. By dealing with Lazarus, an individual's assessment of the prospects of producing is those behavioral or cognitive behaviors that will have a positive effect on a personally significant experience. Future expectations refer to the determination of an encounter's further path with regard to objective congruence or incongruence.

Specific patterns of primary and secondary assessment relate to multiple forms of stress. Three types are differentiated: damage, risk, and challenge (Lazarus and Folkman 1984). Harm refers to the damage or failure (psychological) that has already occurred. The danger is the fear of damage that may be inevitable. The challenge stems from requirements that a person feels secure about mastering. In particular types of emotional responses, these various types of psychological stress are embedded, demonstrating the strong relation between the areas of stress and emotions.

15 essential emotions are distinguished by Lazarus (1991). Nine of these are negative (anger, fear, anxiety, remorse, shame, sadness, envy, jealousy, and disgust), while four are positive (happiness, pride, relief, and love). (Two more feelings, hope and sympathy, have a mixed valence.) For example, the anxiety response is based on the following pattern of primary and secondary evaluations at a molecular level of analysis: the experience must have some objective significance. In addition, the incongruence of priorities is strong, i.e. private objectives are thwarted. Ultimately, ego- engagement focuses on the defense of personal sense or ego- identity from existential threats. Specific assessment patterns linked to stress or different emotional reactions are defined as core relational themes at a more molar level. For instance, the theme of anxiety is conflict



with uncertainty and existential risk. However, the central emotional theme of relief is 'a distressing goal-incongruent situation that has improved or gone away for the better' (Lazarus 1991).

Coping is closely linked to the notion of cognitive evaluation and, thus, to the tension of related transactions between individuals and the environment.

The following consequences are found in this description. (a) Coping acts are not defined according to their consequences (e.g., as distorting reality), but according to the features of the coping mechanism. (b) This phase involves both behavioral and cognitive reactions in the individual. (c) Coping consists of multiple single actions in most cases and is arranged sequentially, creating a coping episode. In this context, coping is also characterized by the occurrence of various action scenes concurrently and, thus, an interconnection of episodes of coping. (d) The emphasis on various components of a traumatic experience can be differentiated by coping behavior (cf. Lazarus and Folkman 1984). They will try to alter the realities of the individual-environment behind negative feelings or tension (problem-focused coping). They may also appeal to internal elements and try to minimize a negative emotional state, or alter the appraisal of the challenging situation (emotion-focused coping).

1.2.3. Resource Theories of Stress: The Conservation of Resources theory

For not mentioning the beneficial implications of stress, many of the popular stress explanations have been criticized. The Conservation of Resources (COR) model proposed by Hobfoll (1989) is one example, which includes many stress theories, but also expands these theories by the use of a resource perspective. This stress model was introduced by Hobfoll (1989) as an effort to bridge the difference between environmental and cognitive perspectives. The basic tenet of the model is that people seek to preserve, protect, and develop valued resources, which are threatening the potential or real loss. These resources are those objects, personal features, conditions, or energies that are valued by the individual or that serve as a means of achieving those objects, personal characteristics, conditions, or energies (Hobfoll 1989). Stress occurs, according to this model, when resources are lost or threatened. Therefore, individuals will aim to mitigate net loss of these resources when faced with stressors, and when not pressured, individuals will grow resource surpluses to offset the risk of potential loss. The COR model extends to previous stress models by explaining not just what people do when dealing with stress, but also in the absence of risks. Many social and personal constructs have been suggested, such as social support (Schwarzer and Leppin 1991), sense of coherence (Antonovsky 1979), hardiness (Kobasa 1979), self-efficacy (Bandura 1977), or optimism (Scheier and Carver 1992). Hardiness is an amalgam of three elements: internal power, determination, and a sense of difficulty as opposed to risk. Likewise, the sense of coherence is that the universe is meaningful, predictable, and ultimately benevolent. Several forms of instrumental, descriptive, evaluation, and emotional support have been examined within the social support sector.

The recently offered theory of resource conservation (COR) (Hobfoll 1989, Hobfoll et al. 1996) suggests that stress arises in any of three contexts: when people encounter resource depletion, when resources are threatened, or when people invest their resources without benefit. Four resource types are proposed: resource items (i.e. physical objects such as home, clothes, or transportation access), resource conditions (e.g., jobs, personal relationships), personal resources (e.g., expertise or self-efficacy), and energy resources (e.g. means that facilitate the attainment of other resources, for example, money, credit, or knowledge). A number of testable theories (called principles) derived from fundamental COR assumptions were outlined by Hobfoll and co-workers (cf. Hobfoll et al. 1996).

1. The primary cause of stress is the lack of capital. This theory contradicts the basic concept of essential life event approaches (cf. Holmes and Rahe 1967) that stress exists if people are required to respond to situational situations, whether these conditions are positive (e.g. marriage) or negative (e.g. marriage) (e.g., loss of a beloved person). Hobfoll and Lilly (1993) found that only the lack of resources was linked to distress in an empirical test of this basic concept.

2. To conserve and protect other resources, resources act. Self-esteem is a valuable resource for other services that could be helpful. For example, Hobfoll and Leiberma (1987) found that when faced with stress, women who were high in self-esteem made good use of social support, while those who lacked self-esteem perceived social support as a sign of personal inadequacy and thus misused support.

3. Individuals have a rapidly depleted resource pool to combat more stress following challenging circumstances. This depletion impairs the capacity of individuals to cope with more stress, resulting in a spiral of failure. This resource investment view of the process involves reflecting on how the interplay between resources and situational demands shifts over time as stressor sequences unfold. Moreover, this theory demonstrates that it is important to analyze not just the influence of the resources on the outcome, but also the impact of the outcomes on the resources.

2. Coping

In order to try and master, reduce or accept stress and conflict, coping involves investing one's own deliberate effort to solve personal and interpersonal problems. Coping techniques or coping skills are generally called psychological coping mechanisms. Generally, the term coping refers to adaptive (constructive) coping strategies, that is, stress-reducing strategies. Other coping mechanisms, on the other hand, may be described as maladaptive if they raise tension. Therefore, maladaptive coping is often defined as non-coping, based on its outcome. In addition, the term coping usually refers to reactive coping,



i.e. the stressor-following coping reaction. This is distinct from constructive coping, in which a coping reaction is aimed at neutralizing a possible stressor. Subconscious or unconscious techniques are usually omitted from the field of coping (e.g. defense mechanisms). The coping effort's effectiveness depends on the type of stress, the individual, and the circumstances. Responses to coping are controlled in part by personality (usual characteristics), but also in part by the social environment, especially the nature of the stressful environment.

2.1. Theories of coping

The theory of coping is a wide field of science that is divided into two independent parameters:

1. Theories Focus-oriented (trait and state).
2. Theories that are approach-oriented (micro-analytic and macro-analytic).

2.1.1. Theories of the focus-oriented state and characteristics

These coping theories consider the inner resources and mental skills of a person to determine how well he can respond to a situation. The trait-oriented (or dispositional) approach seeks to classify people whose coping resources and tendencies are insufficient for the demands of a particular stressful experience at an early stage. An early identification of these individual would provide the opportunity for a selection (or placement) protocol or an effective primary prevention program to be created. State-oriented analysis, i.e., concentrating on actual coping, has a more general target. This study explores the relationships between an individual's coping strategies and outcome variables such as self-reported or objectively registered coping efficacy, emotional responses preceding and following certain coping attempts, or adaptation outcome variables (e.g., health status or test performance).

The approach-oriented micro and macro analytic coping theories, on the other hand, revolve around how specific or abstract the mechanisms of coping are (Carver, 1989).

2.1.2. Theories of macro-analytic trait-oriented coping

1. Repression-sensitization: This hypothesis describes that coping occurs at one end and sensitization at the other along a bipolar dimension of repression. In order to mitigate its influence, people who cope with repression tend to deny or disregard the existence of a stressor. On the flip side, sensitizers appear to react to the sudden encounter with intense thoughts, worrisome, and obsessive impulses (Lazarus and Cohen, 1979).

2. Monitoring and Blunting Theory: This theory describes that by using your cognitive mechanisms, you can decrease the impact of a stressful stimulus. To ignore temporary stressors, blunting strategies such as denial, restructuring, and diversion support. Monitoring techniques are more helpful for coping with chronic negative stress and anxieties, including information processing and emotional regulation.

3. Model of Coping Modes (MCM): This theory is an extension of the model of monitoring-blunting and has some similarities with the theory of repression-sensitization. It builds on the notion of cognitive avoidance and shows that we are instinctively motivated to avoid and view a difficult situation as ambiguous.

2.1.3. State-oriented macro-analytic theories

Freud (1926) cites defensive mechanisms as one of the earliest macro-analytical state-oriented coping strategies. The theory of Richard Lazarus and Susan Folkman is another approach that has gained prominence in this field. The model of Lazarus and Folkman claimed that effective coping mechanisms rely on the emotional functions associated with the problem. Eight such roles were classified by Lazarus that most of us use for successful coping. They include:

Self-Control-where, in reaction to stress, we strive to control our feelings.

Confrontation-where we face pressure and retribution to alter the situation and return it to our favor.

Social support-where we chat to others and search for social ties to help us survive a tough time.

Emotional distancing-where we remain oblivious to what is going on and avoid our acts from being controlled by the pain.

Escape and avoidance-where we deny that stress occurs as a reaction to coping.

Radical acceptance-Where one resorts to unconditional self-acceptance to respond to adversity.

Positive reappraisal-where we strive to find and learn from the response in the struggle.

Strategic problem-solving-where concrete solution-focused methods are applied to get through the hard time and redirect our behaviors accordingly.

Psychologists accept that methods of coping differ from individual to individual and from time to time. No two persons will use the same tactics to get through a problem. To respond to similar stressors at different points in life, even the same person may use two entirely different coping strategies. Lazarus' eight roles form the foundation of successful emotional coping and, when enduring stress, lie at the heart of our actions. Coping studies in mental health have shown that there is a robust neurobiological correlation between stress and adaptation. A host of research and literary reviews have shown that the stress



management strategies we use help to restore functions in the body at molecular levels (Scheier and Carver, 1985). There are three classes or sub-divisions of coping mechanisms based on these findings:

1. Yoga, painting, naturopathy, breathing exercises, and muscle relaxation provide physiological coping.
2. Cognitive coping, including consciousness, restructuring of mind, and meditation.
3. Environmental coping, including walks in nature, pet bonding, etc.

The idea of cognitive evaluation and reappraisal was invented by Lazarus and Folkman. Stress coping, according to their theory, means an intricate method of thought and allocating meaning to it. They explained the coping mechanism through the stress cycle where the understanding of the stressful situation by a person determines how to cope with it (Anshel, 1996; Anshel and Weinberg, 1999; Roth and Cohen, 1986).

2. CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

History has demonstrated researchers' interests in researching stress from many different fields, such as biological sciences, genetics, biochemistry, neurophysiology, psychological sciences, personality, developmental psychology, social ecology, and psychoanalysis, as well as social sciences, such as anthropology, military history, and sociology. Therefore, a lot of criticism has been faced in the area of tension. The stress word was, however, initially borrowed from physics.

In the discipline of physics, the inference of stress can be traced to 1676, where Hooke's Law demonstrated that a different degree of strain or distortion on different materials was created by the impact of external stress or load. Stress was regarded by physics and engineering as a stimulus. They assumed that stressor was a stimulus that generates a response to a behavioral change. They assumed that stress was caused by certain circumstances and environments, regardless of differences in the object (R. Lazarus & S. Folkman, 1984). Later, Hans Selye invented the concept in 1926 in health science. He noticed that people were suffering from various diseases, but similar symptoms were registered. He then used the term stress, defining it as the "sum of all nonspecific changes (within an organism) caused by function or damage" He indicated that stress is a reaction that stressors produce. Thus, he explained the stress response strategy. Physics and engineering thus followed the stimulus approach and the response approach to stress was embraced by biology and medicine (R. Lazarus & S. Folkman, 1984).

Some researchers therefore conceived stress as a stimulus, whereas some thought it was a response, but modern researchers accept that stress is a particular stimulus-response transaction. Researcher recognized that all stimulus and response methods have partial utility as stimulus can only be represented as stressful if it resulted in the individual's stress response. Researchers therefore suggested the transactional stress method that considered the relationship of individuals and the environment. Stress is any condition that threatens or is considered to jeopardize one's well-being and therefore tax one's coping skills, according to the transaction approach

REFERENCES

- [1] Antonovsky, A. (1979). *Health, stress, and coping*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- [2] Arnold, M. B. (1960). *Emotion and personality* (2 Vols.). New York: Columbia University Press.
- [3] Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84, 191–215.
- [4] Bruner, J. S., & Postman, L. (1947). Emotional selectivity in perception and reaction. *Journal of Personality*, 16, 69–77.
- [5] Brunswik, E. (1947). *Systematic and representative design of psychological experiments: With results in physical and social perception*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- [6] Byrne, D. (1964). Repression–sensitization as a dimension of personality. In B. A. Maher (Ed.), *Progress in experimental personality research* (Vol. 1, pp. 169–220). New York: Academic Press.
- [7] Engel, B. T. (1985). Stress is a noun! No, a verb! No, an adjective. In T. M. Field, P. M. McCabe, & N. Schneiderman (Eds.), *Stress and coping* (pp. 3–12). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- [8] Eriksen, C. W. (1966). Cognitive responses to internally cued anxiety. In C. D. Spielberger (Ed.), *Anxiety and behavior* (pp. 327–360). New York: Academic Press.
- [9] Folkman, S., & Lazarus, R. S. (1980). An analysis of coping in a middle-aged community sample. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 21, 219–239.
- [10] Folkman, S., & Lazarus, R. S. (1988). *Ways of coping questionnaire: Research edition*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- [11] Freud, A. (1936). *Das Ich und die Abwehrmechanismen* [The ego and the mechanisms of defense]. Vienna: Internationaler Psychoanalytischer Verlag.



- [12] Freud, S. (1926). *Hemmung, Symptom und Angst* [Inhibitions, symptoms and anxiety]. Vienna: Internationaler Psychoanalytischer Verlag.
- [13] Hinkle, L. E. (1974). The concept of 'stress' in the biological and social sciences. *International Journal of Psychiatry in Medicine*, 5, 335–357.
- [14] Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *American Psychologist*, 44, 513–524.
- [15] Hobfoll, S. E., Freedy, J. R., Green, B. L., & Solomon, S. D. (1996). Coping reactions to extreme stress: The roles of resource loss and resource availability. In M. Zeidner & N. S. Endler (Eds.), *Handbook of coping: Theory, research, applications* (pp. 322–349). New York: Wiley.
- [16] Hobfoll, S. E., & Leiberman, J. R. (1987). Personality and social resources in immediate and continued stress-resistance among women. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52, 18–26.
- [17] Hobfoll, S. E., & Lilly, R. S. (1993). Resource conservation as a strategy for community psychology. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 21, 128–148.
- [18] Holmes, T. H., & Rahe, R. H. (1967). The social readjustment rating scale. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, 11, 213–218.
- [19] Janis, I. L. (1958). *Psychological stress: Psychoanalytic and behavioral studies of surgical patients*. New York: Wiley.
- [20] Janis, I. L. (1983). Stress inoculation in health care: Theory and research. In D. Meichenbaum & M. Jaremko (Eds.), *Stress reduction and prevention* (pp. 67–99). New York: Plenum.
- [21] Karoly, P. (1999). A goal systems self-regulatory perspective on personality, psychopathology, and change. *Review of General Psychology*, 3, 264–291.
- [22] Kobasa, S. C. (1979). Stressful life events, personality, and health: An inquiry into hardiness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37, 1–11.
- [23] Kohlmann, C.-W. (1997). *Persönlichkeit und Emotionsregulation: Defensive Bewältigung von Angst und Streß* [Personality and the regulation of emotion]. Bern, Switzerland: Huber.
- [24] Krohne, H. W. (1978). Individual differences in coping with stress and anxiety. In C. D. Spielberger & I. G. Sarason (Eds.), *Stress and anxiety* (Vol. 5, pp. 233–260). Washington, DC: Hemisphere.
- [25] Krohne, H. W. (1993). Vigilance and cognitive avoidance as concepts in coping research. In H. W. Krohne (Ed.), *Attention and avoidance: Strategies in coping with aversiveness* (pp. 19–50). Seattle, WA: Hogrefe & Huber.
- [26] Krohne, H. W. (1996). Individual differences in coping. In M. Zeidner & N. S. Endler (Eds.), *Handbook of coping: Theory, research, applications* (pp. 381–409). New York: Wiley.
- [27] Krohne, H. W., Egloff, B., Varner, L. J., Burns, L. R., Weidner, G., & Ellis, H. C. (2000). The assessment of dispositional vigilance and cognitive avoidance: Factorial structure, psychometric properties, and validity of the Mainz Coping Inventory. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 24, 297–311.
- [28] Krohne, H. W., Hock, M., & Kohlmann, C.-W. (1992). Coping dispositions, uncertainty, and emotional arousal. In K. T. Strongman (Ed.), *International review of studies on emotion* (Vol. 2, pp. 73–95). Chichester, UK: Wiley.
- [29] Lazarus, R. S. (1966). *Psychological stress and the coping process*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- [30] Lazarus, R. S. (1974). Psychological stress and coping in adaptation and illness. *International Journal of Psychiatry in Medicine*, 5, 321–333.
- [31] Lazarus, R. S. (1990). Theory-based stress measurement. *Psychological Inquiry*, 1, 3–13.
- [32] Lazarus, R. S. (1991). *Emotion and adaptation*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- [33] Lazarus, R. S. (1993). Coping theory and research: Past, present, and future. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 55, 234–247.
- [34] Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, appraisal, and coping*. New York: Springer.
- [35] Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1986). Cognitive theories of stress and the issue of circularity. In M. H. Appley & R. Trumbull (Eds.), *Dynamics of stress: Physiological, psychological, and social perspectives* (pp. 63–80). New York: Plenum.
- [36] Lazarus, R. S., & Launier, R. (1978). Stress-related transactions between person and environment. In L. A. Pervin & M. Lewis (Eds.), *Perspectives in interactional psychology* (pp. 287–327). New York: Plenum.
- [37] Mason, J. W. (1971). A re-evaluation of the concept of 'non-specificity' in stress theory. *Journal of*



Psychiatric Research, 8, 323–333.

- [38] Mason, J. W. (1975). A historical view of the stress field. Part I. *Journal of Human Stress*, 1, 6–12.
- [39] McGrath, J. E. (1982). Methodological problems in research on stress. In H. W. Krohne & L. Laux (Eds.), *Achievement, stress, and anxiety* (pp. 19–48). Washington, DC: Hemisphere.
- [40] Miller, S. M. (1980). When is little information a dangerous thing? Coping with stressful events by monitoring versus blunting. In S. Levine & H. Ursin (Eds.), *Health and coping* (pp. 145–169). New York: Plenum.
- [41] Miller, S. M. (1987). Monitoring and blunting: Validation of a questionnaire to assess styles of information seeking under threat. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52, 345–353.
- [42] Miller, S. M., & Mangan, C. E. (1983). Interacting effects of information and coping style in adapting to gynecologic stress: Should the doctor tell all? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 45, 223–236.
- [43] Mischel, W., & Shoda, Y. (1995). A cognitive-affective system theory of personality: Reconceptualizing situations, dispositions, dynamics, and invariance in personality structure. *Psychological Review*, 102, 248–268.
- [44] Mullen, B., & Suls, J. (1982). The effectiveness of attention and rejection as coping styles: A meta-analysis of temporal differences. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, 26, 43–49.
- [45] Roth, S., & Cohen, L. J. (1986). Approach, avoidance, and coping with stress. *American Psychologist*, 41, 813–819.
- [46] Scheier, M. F., & Carver, C. S. (1992). Effects of optimism on psychological and physical well-being: Theoretical overview and empirical update. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 16, 201–228.
- [47] Schwarzer, R., & Leppin, A. (1991). Social support and health: A theoretical and empirical overview. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 8, 99–127.
- [48] Schwarzer, R., & Schwarzer, C. (1996). A critical survey of coping instruments. In M. Zeidner & N. S. Endler (Eds.), *Handbook of coping: Theory, research, applications* (pp. 107–132). New York: Wiley.
- [49] Selye, H. (1976). *The stress of life* (Rev. ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- [50] Thoits, P. A. (1983). Dimensions of life events that influence psychological distress: An evaluation and synthesis of the literature. In H. B. Kaplan (Ed.), *Psychosocial stress: Trends in theory and research* (pp. 33–103). New York: Academic Press.

fffff